

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 7 being the independent claims. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0018349 (Kinnunen). Claims 3, 5, 11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinnunen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,907,225 (Wilkinson).

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of independent Claim 1, the Examiner states that Kinnunen teaches, in paragraph 0077 that an available service is equivalent to at least one function in the present invention. Further, the Examiner states that Kinnunen teaches, in paragraphs 100-101, the recitation of activating a menu for selecting the at least one function available from the user when the at least one preset condition is met, as recited in Claim 1. It is believed that the Examiner is incorrect in stating the above.

Unlike the present invention, Kinnunen teaches that the service is a service provided from the network, instead of it being a function of the mobile communication terminal. Further, Kinnunen only teaches changing a service according to a particular area or a user's activity [Para. 0079], and fails to recite changing a menu to be activated according to the user's classes, as disclosed in the present invention. In particular, it is taught that as shown in Fig. 2, a user profile agent 220 is

included in a Mobile Entity (ME) 214, and also provides the preferences which have been recorded by the user [Para. 0100].

As a result, if a user profile is changed by directly recording the preferences by the user according to Kinnunen, functions of the mobile communication terminal that are restrictively provided according to the user classes, as disclosed in the present invention cannot be achieved.

Still further, with respect to paragraphs 100-101, Kinnunen teaches a user profile agent (220) provides preferences which may have been recorded by the user and a service view agent (222) provides the ME (Mobile Entity) with the capability to browse services on a network (212). However, this does not teach or suggest the recitation of activating a menu for selecting the at least one function available from the user when the at least one preset condition is met, as recited by Claim 1.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner incorrectly asserts that Kinnunen teaches activation (of the menu) when the at least one preset condition is met. Kinnunen specifically teaches an ME needs to receive a notification (e.g., URL) before it is able to establish a relationship with the service.

Accordingly, as Kinnunen does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 1, it does not anticipate said claim, which is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Claim 7 includes

similar recitations as those contained in independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 7 is believed to be patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent Claim 1. Therefore, Kinnunen also does not anticipate independent Claim 7, which is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Without conceding the patentability of dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-14, per se, these dependent claims are nevertheless patentably distinct from Kinnunen for at least the above-described reasons why Kinnunen fails to anticipate independent Claim 1 and 7, respectively.

Claim 15 has been newly added to more fully claim the present invention. Newly added Claim 15 does not contain any new matter and is therefore in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, it is believed that Claims 1-14 and newly added Claim 15 are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 1-14 be withdrawn and the Claims 1-14 together with newly added Claim 15 be allowed. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/SNB/mk

/